



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Division

Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

51493

0-315-03598-6

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

Lynn Carol Hazen

Date of Birth — Date de naissance

August 12, 1952

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

Canada

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

*86 Lester Crescent
St. Albert
Alberta T8N-2C1*

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

The Effective Manager: Assessing the Validity of a Sex-Role Stereotype

University — Université

University of Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

Master of Business Administration

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

1981

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

Dallas Cullen

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date

December 15, 1980

Signature

Lynn Hazen



National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

The Effective Manager: Assessing the Validity of a Sex-Role
Stereotype

by



Lynn C. Hazen

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF Master of Business Administration

Business Administration and Commerce

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Spring 1981

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Effective Manager: Assessing the Validity of a Sex-Role Stereotype submitted by Lynn C. Hazen in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

... Dallas Cullen

Supervisor

... [Signature]
... [Signature]

Date... November 28, 1980...

Abstract

In an attempt to determine the relationship between sex, sex-role identity, and managerial effectiveness, 80 male and 80 female middle line managers completed a self-report questionnaire consisting of Hersey and Blanchard's Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory (LASI; 1974) and the short form of Spence and Helmreich's Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; 1978). Results from the LASI, designed to assess managerial effectiveness, and the PAQ, developed to measure sex-role identity, supported the main hypotheses of the research. Sex and sex-role identity were found to be unrelated, as were sex and managerial effectiveness, while sex-role identity and managerial effectiveness were shown to be highly associated for both sexes. Specifically, androgynous individuals of both sexes (men and women high in both masculinity and femininity) scored highest in tests of managerial effectiveness; while masculine and feminine sex-typed managers, regardless of biological sex, were found to be of intermediate and approximately equal effectiveness; and undifferentiated individuals (managers scoring low in both masculinity and femininity) were found to be the least effective. An assessment of the real-world validity of these findings, which may reflect the ideal more than the real, is encouraged.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. The Stereotypes	2
Sex-Role Stereotypes	2
Managerial Stereotypes	6
B. The Realities	13
Accuracy of Sex-Role Stereotypes	14
Accuracy of Managerial Stereotypes	17
C. Androgyny	21
D. The Effective Manager	26
E. Androgyny and Effective Management	33
F. Research Hypotheses	36
II. METHOD	40
A. Subjects	40
B. Materials	41
C. Procedure	43
III. RESULTS	45
IV. DISCUSSION	50
REFERENCES	58
APPENDICES	70
A. Appendix 1: Personal Information and Instructions	70
B. Appendix 2: Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory or LASI	73
C. Appendix 3: Personal Attributes Questionnaire or PAQ	80

List of Tables

TABLE 1: Scheme for classifying individuals on M and F scores by a median split

TABLE 2: Proportion of managers (total and by sex) falling into each of the 4 categories based on median splits of M and F scores

TABLE 3: Mean effectiveness scores (adaptability) for the total sample by sex and sex-role identity

TABLE 4: Summary table for the analysis of variance involving sex, sex-role identity, and effectiveness

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years the role of women in management has become an important social issue. Increasingly, industry has come to recognize the need for more effective utilization of women as a manpower resource, while women have focused attention on occupations traditionally dominated by men. A deluge of books, and anthologies of articles and studies (e.g. Basil, 1972; Loring & Wells, 1972; Gordon & Strober, 1975; Hennig & Jardim, 1977; Jewell, 1977; Larwood & Wood, 1977; Burrow, 1978; Stead, 1978) attest to the attention the issue has received. But the conclusion of these volumes is strikingly similar: despite pressures for change from the feminist movement, increased educational opportunities for women, and the growing body of anti-sexual discrimination legislation, it remains as true today as a decade ago that women are distinctly underrepresented at the middle and upper management levels.

Most contemporary management writers agree that, in their attempts to overcome the formal, physical obstacles impeding the advancement of women into management, many advocates of equality have overlooked the informal, psychological barriers blocking the corporate progress of women. Legal equality is not the same as attitudinal equality and, as many women managers are discovering, these covert barriers may prove to be the most formidable. While legislating equality can, and is, removing overt sexual

discrimination in matters of managerial recruitment, remuneration, placement, promotion, and development, it cannot alter the negative attitudes that hamper aspiring women executives in their struggle for acceptance into the managerial fold.

A comprehensive summary of the sociopsychological factors hindering the advancement of women in the professions appears in an article by Prather (1971), while O'Leary (1974) provides an excellent review of the literature which focuses on these internal and external attitudinal barriers confronting women who aspire to non-traditional roles. Various researchers have reiterated these ideas (Bennett, 1964; Basil, 1972; Epstein, 1975; Gordon & Strober, 1975 (Chap. 9); Fenn, 1976; Putnam & Heinen, 1976; Terborg, 1977), while others have outlined the conventional mythology surrounding women in management and working women in general (Basil, 1972; Loring & Wells, 1972 (Chap. 8); Crowley, Levitin, & Quinn, 1973; Women's Bureau, 1974; Athanassiades, 1975).

A. The Stereotypes

Sex-Role Stereotypes

Among the psychological challenges external to women themselves, societal sex stereotypes and the resultant attitudes toward competency in females are perhaps the most serious obstacles facing the managerial woman.

While the prognosis is good for women successfully

meeting and overcoming the majority of their own work-related fears and challenges with growing experience and expertise, eliminating the negative stereotypic prejudices of others is much harder. Like most stereotypes, these pervasive beliefs have a tendency to be widespread, consensual, and highly resistant to change, regardless of the amount or quality of contradictory evidence available.

The existence of sex-role and sex characteristic stereotypes in our society, both in the past and present, is well documented (Fernberger, 1948; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957; Sherriffs & McKee, 1957; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968; Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Ellis & Bentler, 1973; Bem, 1974; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974, 1975). The differential valuations of behaviors and characteristics stereotypically ascribed to men and women are also well established, with feminine traits generally considered less socially desirable and unhealthy for the competent, mature adult (Sherriffs & McKee, 1957; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957, 1959; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968; Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970). In fact, Broverman et al. (1970) reported that practicing clinicians held professional standards for adult mental health in general conforming closely to the masculine stereotype; while normal mental health for women characterized females as being submissive, noncompetitive,

conceited about appearance, dependent, excitable in minor crises, and in general, quite childlike and inconsistent with adult responsibilities and adequate adult functioning.

But perhaps the most striking thing about this body of research is the remarkable consistency over time of the consensual beliefs about the differing characteristics of men and women in our society.

Some early research conducted by Fernberger (1948), for example, found that both male and female college students strongly believed in the overall superiority of men, rating men as intelligent, independent, and sensible; while viewing women as sensitive, dependent, and submissive.

A decade later, Sherriffs and McKee (McKee & Sherriffs, 1957, 1959; Sherriffs & McKee, 1957) found that college students of both sexes still placed a higher value on stereotypically masculine characteristics, reporting men to be competent, realistic, stable, logical, self-confident, and independent; while women, who were less favorably regarded, were perceived as tactful, sociable, gentle, warm, sentimental, and neurotic.

A further decade later, similar results were reported once again in a study by Rosenkrantz et al. (1968). Here, it was found that among male and female college students, men were perceived as aggressive, independent, objective, and logical; while women were regarded as gentle, tactful, quiet, empathic, and socially aware. Again, both men and women agreed that masculine traits were more socially

desirable than feminine traits.

Even today, the stereotypes exist in a virtually unchanged form (Bem, 1974; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974, 1975). Regardless of the age of the study or the population of respondents sampled, studies of trait stereotypes have consistently demonstrated that the typical male and female are predictably perceived as differing in a number of personality attributes. The masculine cluster of characteristics reflects personal competencies and goal orientation, while the feminine cluster of characteristics reflects social-emotional sensitivity and an interpersonal orientation.

Despite the fact that different theorists have designated different labels for these domains, there is an essential agreement among them that men are primarily responsible for the economic well-being of the family and are its representatives in the outside world, while women are primarily responsible for child care and for ministering to the physical and emotional needs of family members.

According to Parsons and Bales (1955), masculinity has been associated with an "instrumental" orientation, a cognitive focus on getting the job done or the problem solved, whereas femininity has been associated with an "expressive" orientation, an affective concern for the welfare of others and the harmony of the group. Similarly, Bakan (1966) has identified two fundamental properties that characterize living organisms. He has suggested that a sense

of "agency", manifested in such characteristics as self-assertion, self-protectiveness, and self-aggrandizement, is stronger in males than females; while a sense of "communion", manifested in selflessness and a desire to be at one with others, is stronger in females than males.

Whatever the label applied, men have typically been assigned extradomestic role responsibilities and expected to develop independence, self-reliance, and other instrumental skills that will permit them to discharge their familial and societal obligations; while women have traditionally been allocated domestic role responsibilities, with the expectation that they will develop the nurturant, expressive characteristics necessary to the effective performance of their interpersonal tasks.

Managerial Stereotypes

The effects on society of this differential role assignment, and the expectations associated with each role, are extensive. In addition to their important implications for the structure and functioning of the family, sex-role stereotypes also have significant occupational repercussions.

In her classic studies, Schein (1973, 1975) investigated the extent of male and female stereotypes and their relationship to the stereotype of successful managers. In her original study, Schein (1973) surveyed male middle managers of insurance companies from various locations

throughout the United States, asking them to use a list of 92 adjectives to describe women in general (Women), men in general (Men), or successful middle managers (Managers). While there were very marked discrepancies between the descriptions of Women and Men and the descriptions of Women and Managers, there was a high degree of similarity between the descriptions of Men and Managers. Of 86 traits evaluated as important for effective management, 60 were judged more typical of males than females, while only 8 of 86 traits were judged more typical of females than males.

Schein (1975) later replicated this study using female managers as subjects, and again, the same basic pattern of results was obtained. On the basis of these findings, Schein concluded that successful middle managers are perceived by both male and female managers to possess those characteristics, attitudes, and temperaments more commonly ascribed to men in general than to women in general. Her position is neatly summarized in the heading of a later article entitled "Think Manager - Think Male" (Schein, 1976). In all three articles, Schein further conjectures that the acceptance of the stereotypical male characteristics as being requisite ones for managerial success may well explain the preponderance of male managers and the psychological barriers, both other and self-inflicted, impeding the progress of women in management today.

A current replication of Schein's studies (Massengill &

DiMarco, 1979) involving both male and female business students, a sample of future managers, and using the 92 item descriptive adjective list, concluded that the overall pattern of results obtained was quite similar to that reported earlier by Schein, and re-emphasized the sentiment that women will probably continue to find it difficult to gain access to and acceptance in middle and upper management positions as long as the occupation remains sex-typed.

Similarly, in an indirect, but closely related investigation of this phenomenon, Powell and Butterfield (1979) report additional support for the existence of deleterious managerial stereotypes. Despite sex, age, and work experience differences in their composition, neither a sample of undergraduate business students, nor one composed of working graduates, differed in their descriptions of a good manager as predominantly masculine. Again, these researchers reiterated the negative long run implications of this attitude for aspiring female managers, and concluded that no significant change in sex-role stereotypes or managerial perceptions was apparent despite the many formal pressures for equality:

Carrying this argument one step further, Putnam and Heinen (1976) observe that women in our society face a double bind in the management role. Like Schein, they state that a successful leader is typically believed to be an individual who is aggressive, forceful, competitive, achievement-oriented, self-confident, and independent; in

short, one who possesses traits more often associated with men than with women. Further, they note that women are generally depicted as emotional, passive, dependent, nurturant, intuitive, and submissive, and consequently, that the woman manager frequently finds herself in an impossible position. If she behaves according to the cultural definition of a leader, she is condemned as being unfeminine, while displaying traits stereotypically considered feminine leads to rejection as an unacceptable manager. Since she cannot simultaneously conform to society's expectations of both woman and manager, she frequently does not seek, or is informally barred from, entry into management level positions.

A host of other reports and surveys support the notion that management is a male sex-typed occupation which generally favors men and discourages women. In an early executive study, Gilmer (1961) reported that a substantial majority of male managers believed women to be inferior to men in supervisory positions, having higher rates of absenteeism, more work related problems, and a general tendency to behave neurotically.

One classic executive survey (Bowman, Worthy, & Greyser, 1965) reported that the majority of male respondents believed women to be unstable and temperamentally unfit for management, while many expressed the sentiment that men experience discomfort working for a woman and that managerial females have a generally

deleterious effect on employee morale.

Another executive survey (Bass, Krusell, & Alexander, 1971) examining male managers' perceptions of female managers revealed that men perceived women as unsuitable managerial candidates because of their biological and personal undependability, their lack of supervisory potential, and the societal appropriateness of women's deference toward men.

In yet another executive survey, Basil (1972) found that while decisiveness, consistency, objectivity, and emotional stability were considered the most important requisite management skills, neither sex perceived women as possessing any of these characteristics. Instead, respondents stated that women were not as rational, could not be as objective, were inclined to jealousy, and were apt to make decisions based on emotionalism. Again, both sexes reported a dislike of female superiors, while men expressed reluctance to accept managerial women as peers.

Finally, a more recent and extensive executive survey (Rosen & Jerdee, 1978) of male managers' perceptions of sex differences reported findings strikingly similar to those of earlier researchers. In this large, national sample of U.S. managers and administrators, perceptions were consistently more favorable toward the employability and promotability of men, with women viewed significantly less favorably in terms of the knowledge, aptitudes, skills, motivation, interests, temperaments, and work habits demanded in most managerial

positions. Whereas men were perceived as superior leaders and decision makers, temperamentally better able to cope with the stress and pressure of challenging managerial positions, women were regarded as more emotional, timid, jealous, sensitive to criticism, unreliable and undependable, and were felt to have abilities and interests more compatible with routine, clerical tasks.

Clearly, little or no attitudinal change has occurred over the past several decades; and it would appear that the managerial model proposed by McGregor (1967) is still as widely held today as it was a decade or more ago. At that time, McGregor wrote:

The model of the successful manager in our culture is a masculine one. The good manager is aggressive, competitive, firm and just. He is not feminine, he is not soft and yielding or dependent or intuitive in the womanly sense. The very expression of emotion is widely viewed as a feminine weakness that would interfere with business processes. (p. 23)

Myths and misconceptions about women in management are not confined solely to negative attitudes about the suitability of female managers, but have unfortunately manifested themselves behaviorally both in controlled experiments and in mock and actual personnel decisions in the workplace.

Numerous experiments have demonstrated the commonly held societal belief that women are less competent than men, with important implications for existing and aspiring women executives. Goldberg (1968), for example, has shown that even women are highly prejudiced in their evaluation of the

intellectual and professional competence of other women. When female college students were asked to rate journal articles on value, persuasiveness, profundity, writing style, and competence, identical papers were perceived as higher quality work when they were attributed to male authors. Similarly, female raters judged male artistic endeavors as superior to identical contributions attributed to females (Pheterson, Kiesler, & Goldberg, 1971), while highly competent male applicants for a study abroad were favored over females of equally high merit (Deaux & Taynor, 1973). A study by Rosen & Jerdee (1973) examined the effects of a supervisor's sex on effectiveness evaluations, and reported that male managers were regarded as superior as a result of the perceived congruence between the masculine stereotype and the occupational requirements of the supervisory position.

Studies of managerial decisions using both students and executives as subjects report discrimination on the basis of sex in experimental situations involving personnel decisions related to selection (Fidell, 1970; Jones, 1970; Shaw, 1972; Cecil, Paul, & Olins, 1973; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974b, 1974c; Cohen & Bunker, 1975; Dipboye, Fromkin, & Wiback, 1975; Haefner, 1977; Hobart & Harries, 1977), remuneration (Bryce, 1970; Levitin, Quinn, & Staines, 1971, 1973; Astin, 1972; Terborg & Ilgen, 1975; Treiman & Terrell, 1975), placement (Fidell, 1970; Astin, 1972; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974b; Terborg & Ilgen, 1975), promotion (Day & Stogdill, 1972; Rosen &

Jerdee, 1974a, 1974c; Hobart & Harries, 1977), development (Rosen & Jerdee, 1974a, 1974c; Hobart & Harries, 1977), and supervision (Rosen & Jerdee, 1974a). Taken together, these studies report that males are selected for managerial positions significantly more often than females, who are more frequent candidates for clerical jobs, and that males are substantially preferred over identical female job applicants for challenging managerial, technical, and professional positions. Furthermore, subjects tend to award male candidates higher starting salaries and to maintain the economic discrepancy over time, to select them more often for promotions and advanced professional training, to consider them more capable of handling supervisory problems, to take more seriously their recommended solutions in problematic situations, and to explain discrimination against female applicants and employees on the basis of expectations that female managers will engage in maladaptive, sex-stereotyped behavior.

B. The Realities

Clearly, a vast number of studies have demonstrated the existence of managerial and sex stereotypes, and the deleterious effects of this pro-male, anti-female occupational bias on the managerial woman's struggle for equality are also well documented. But an equally, if not more, important issue concerns the validity of these popular stereotypic notions.

Are masculine and feminine stereotypes accurate representations of real males and females? Have they general or specific validity, are they true in whole or part, and are they correct as they relate to men and women managers?

Is it true that cross-sex behaviors and characteristics are really as inappropriate and maladaptive as societal norms and socialization practices would seem to suggest? Should boys and girls in our society be encouraged to think and act according to rigid sex stereotypic definitions of masculinity and femininity?

And what about the accuracy of managerial stereotypes? Is it true that effective managers will typically be men, in particular men who exhibit primarily stereotypical masculine characteristics? Precisely what constitutes managerial effectiveness?

The list of questions is extensive, and some of the tentative answers that have been advanced to these and other issues will now be reviewed before the purpose of the present study, the research questions it set out to examine, or the methodology employed can be outlined and discussed in any meaningful way.

Accuracy of Sex-Role Stereotypes

In recent years, attempts to review the literature and formulate reliable generalizations concerning actual sex differences in abilities and characteristics have yielded mixed results. A review by Garai and Scheinfeld (1968), for example, of nearly 500 research studies reported conclusions

conforming to popular stereotype. Here, women were definitely perceived as the inferior sex, both physically and psychologically. Characterized as limited and shallow in their abilities and interests, women were relegated to traditional occupations and generally regarded as unfit for entry into challenging male-dominated occupations even with appropriate training and opportunity. But given the quality of the studies reviewed and the manner in which they were selected for inclusion, the tentative conclusions advanced were not uncritically accepted as facts by other researchers.

Perhaps the most extensive and credible review of actual psychological differences between men and women in general appears in the work of Maccoby and Jacklin (1974). In their book, a complete and thoughtful summary of the sex difference literature, these authors assembled a large body of evidence concerning precisely how the sexes do and do not differ in many aspects of psychological functioning. In their analysis of over 2000 articles and books, Maccoby and Jacklin concluded that many common assumptions about sex differences, including some widely maintained to be proven, were completely unfounded. This is not to say that men and women do not differ in some interesting ways, but rather demonstrates that myths can and do often pose as facts.

These investigators reported that the beliefs that females have greater verbal ability than males, while males excel in visual-spatial skills and mathematical abilities,

and are more aggressive, are sex differences which are fairly well established and probably true. They further concluded that the weight of the evidence does not support the notions that females are more sociable, are more suggestible, have lower self-esteem, lack achievement motivation, are better at rote learning and simple repetitive tasks, are inclined to be auditory, and are more affected by heredity than males; nor has research generally found that males are superior at tasks requiring higher-level processing, are more analytic, are more visual, and are more influenced by environment than females. Between the valid beliefs and the unfounded ideas, stereotypic notions concerning tactile sensitivity, activity level, competitiveness, dominance, compliance, nurturance, maternal/paternal behavior, fear, timidity, and anxiety were neither fully supported nor refuted by the sparse or ambiguous research findings available.

In a similar vein, Tavris and Offir (1977, Chap. 2), concerned with Maccoby and Jacklin's equal weighting of good and poor quality research, and their tendency to make important sex distinctions on the basis of studies involving only children, reviewed much of the latter's research information, questioning and reanalyzing some of their conclusions while drawing on the results of other studies. They reported no sex differences with regard to general intelligence, cognitive style, sociability, love, and altruism; conflicting results with regard to empathy,

emotionality, dependence, and nurturance; and some evidence in support of sex differences in verbal ability, quantitative ability, creativity, visual-spatial ability, physical abilities, and aggressiveness.

Given the thoroughness of Maccoby and Jacklin's review, the methodological concern of Tavris and Offir, and the relative equivalence of the specific conclusions of each, it appears that the general conclusion that sex differences are far fewer and less significant than popular stereotypes suggest is, in large measure, a valid one.

Accuracy of Managerial Stereotypes

The validity of managerial stereotypes has similarly undergone careful scrutiny. In a later article, as a follow up to their work on the accuracy of sex-role stereotypes in general, Jacklin and Maccoby (1975) addressed the question of whether or not sex differences have implications for women in management. Specifically, they examined the nature of women, outlining those characteristics and business skills in which men and women differ and those in which they are similar, together with the probability of females succeeding in management jobs. In line with their previous research, this review reiterated many of the same sentiments. No significant sex differences were found in the areas of achievement motivation, risk taking, task persistence, general intelligence, learning ability, sociability, affiliation, leadership, or any other area commonly held to be an important determinant of managerial

success in which males allegedly excel. Jacklin and Maccoby conclude that, in summary, nothing in the literature or in their analysis suggests that acquisition of a majority of available leadership positions by men is inevitable or desirable, and that women are equally as capable and competent of assuming organizational leadership positions as their male counterparts.

Other researchers have reported essentially the same beliefs and drawn many of the same conclusions about women in business. Dipboye (1975), for example, outlined 5 stereotypes commonly presented as arguments against women in management and reported that, on the basis of research results, all 5 appear to be fallacious. He concludes that there is no validity to the notions that men are intellectually superior, emotionally more stable, or inherently more assertive than women, that they value achievement, promotion, and meaningful work to a greater extent than women, or that the successful manager typically possesses masculine attributes.

Reif, Newstrom, and Monczka (1975) also examined some myths about managerial women through a research study and a review of other reported findings. They conclude that male and female managers are more similar than dissimilar in beliefs, behaviors, abilities, and skills commonly held to limit the capacity of women to perform effectively in managerial roles, and that many of the stereotypes of women in general are false, or at least unrepresentative of women

who hold or aspire to responsible positions in business.

The results of other studies and reviews of working women in general (Durkin, 1971; Crowley, Levitin, & Quinn, 1973; Women's Bureau, 1974) contain research findings that further debunk the myths and stereotypes surrounding women in the labor force and lend credence to claims that managerial women are unfairly and unnecessarily discriminated against.

Behavioral data, as well, lend some support to the notion that differential treatment of the sexes in management may be unjustified. The popular belief that men are more independent, objective, competitive, and better equipped to handle responsible leadership positions than traditionally gentle, sensitive, and passive women does not receive overwhelming support in empirical tests. While not an exhaustive review of the literature, Brown (1979) provides an excellent comparison of 32 carefully selected studies of male versus female leaders, concluding that while the issue cannot be settled conclusively, the widely held belief that women make inferior leaders seems to give way in actual work situations. On the basis of Brown's review and a consideration of several other studies of leader behavior, it would appear that the stereotypic conclusion of male superiority and female inferiority in appropriate leadership skills is largely unsubstantiated.

Despite some evidence of style differences which may be construed to support the contention that women lack the

University of Alberta

temperament, attributes, and leadership abilities often required of effective managers (Vinacke, 1959; Bond & Vinacke, 1961; Denmark & Diggory, 1966; Megaree, 1969; Maier, 1970; Sashkin & Maier, 1971; Eskilson & Wiley, 1976), there are many other studies which reveal no sex differences in leadership ability. Both in experimental studies and investigations of actual work situations, the absence of sex differences has been consistently reported in the areas of leadership behavior and style (Day & Stogdill, 1972; Chapman, 1975; Osborn & Vicars, 1976; Veiga & Yanouzas, 1976), subordinate satisfaction (Bartol, 1974, 1975; Osborn & Vicars, 1976; Cohen, Bunker, Burton, & McManus, 1978), performance effectiveness (Day & Stogdill, 1972; Jacobson & Effertz, 1974; Wexley & Hunt, 1974), cooperation and competitiveness (Lirtzman & Wahba, 1972), motivation or desire to manage and enjoyment of leadership position (Miner, 1974; Jacobson & Effertz, 1974; Schwartz, 1976; Hennig & Jardim, 1977).

Some studies even report sex differences contrary to expectation. Helmich (1974), for example, found a tendency for male leaders to be more employee-oriented than their female counterparts, who were inclined to be more task-oriented; while Bartol (1975) found that female leaders actually increased slightly the satisfaction of their female subordinates as opposed to male superiors, who had a mildly adverse affect on female followers.

Before more conclusive statements can be made regarding

the similarity or dissimilarity between the sexes in leadership effectiveness, further research, both innovative and replicative, is clearly needed. While it may be premature to conclude with any certainty that men and women are similar in all, or in even most, important aspects of leadership, it is equally erroneous to unquestioningly accept the stereotype of the ineffective female manager.

C. Androgyny

A more central and critical issue concerns the alleged superior psychological health of the individual who behaves in a sex appropriate manner and the implications of this issue for management. For years, society has considered masculinity to be the mark of the psychologically healthy male and femininity to be the mark of the psychologically healthy female. The ideal or healthy personality has traditionally included among its components a sex-role identity congruent with biological gender such that the well-adjusted male is expected to be independent, tough, and assertive, while the mentally fit female is expected to be dependent, sweet, and retiring. Masculinity and femininity have traditionally represented complementary domains of traits and behaviors and, on a bipolar scale, have been conceptualized as opposite ends of a single continuum. The use of a unidimensional scale implies that if a person scores high in femininity, he or she must, by definition, be low in masculinity, and vice-versa. No allowance has been

made by advocates of this position for the intuitively reasonable possibility that a person might possess traits assessable on both masculine and feminine scales, or that an individual may actually score high in two traits stereotypically believed to be bipolar opposites.

Socialization practices, the ostracism of "feminine" men and "masculine" women, and M-F scales in major psychometric instruments (for a review, see Constantinople, 1973), are all evidence of the either/or definition of masculinity and femininity prevalent so long in our culture and of society's attempts to ensure that adult males and females are both aware of and conduct their lives according to stereotypic notions of what is normal and appropriate behavior for their sex.

Recently, however, a number of researchers have come to question the validity of this unidimensional, bipolar conception of masculinity and femininity, suggesting instead a dualistic model in which the two domains are regarded as separate, orthogonal, and equally important dimensions of human personality which vary more or less independently (Bakan, 1966; Block, 1973; Constantinople, 1973; Heilbrun, 1973; Bazin & Freeman, 1974; Bem, 1974, 1975a, 1975b; Pleck, 1975; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Rebecca, Hefner, & Oleshansky, 1976).

Psychological androgyny (from "andro", male and "gyne", female), as it has been termed, denotes the integration of a high degree of both masculinity and femininity within a

single individual. Among those who have advocated androgyny as a new and better standard of psychological health, four instruments designed to measure it have been developed: the Bem Sex-Role Inventory or BSRI (Bem, 1974, 1977b); the Personal Attributes Questionnaire or PAQ (Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp, 1974, 1975; Spence & Helmreich, 1978); the Personality Research Form ANDRO Scale (Berzins, Welling, & Wetter, 1978); and the Adjective Check List masculinity-femininity scale (Heilbrun, 1976). The earliest and most popular of these instruments are the BSRI and the PAQ, which have been widely used by many researchers. The similarities, dissimilarities, advantages, and disadvantages of each have been extensively reviewed and are examined at length elsewhere (Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979; Locksley & Colten, 1979; Spence & Helmreich, 1978, 1979; Helmreich, Spence, & Holahan, 1979; Bem, 1979). Basically, proponents of androgyny suggest that human beings, regardless of sex, should be encouraged to be both masculine and feminine, active and passive, aggressive and gentle, instrumental and expressive, depending on the situational appropriateness of the behavior. Contrary to earlier beliefs that masculinity in males and femininity in females is functional for adaptation and adjustment, these researchers regard the strongly sex-typed individual as seriously limited in the range of behaviors available to him or her, while the androgynous or non-sex-typed person is seen as flexible and adaptable, sensitive to changing situational constraints,

and free to engage in whatever behavior is most appropriate and effective to the task at hand.

Empirical justification for positing androgyny as a model of mental health is readily available. From a brief review of the relevant literature, Bem (1975b) concludes that a high degree of sex-typing may in fact be undesirable for both sexes and associated with generally poorer emotional adjustment. She reports that high femininity in females has been consistently correlated with high anxiety, low self-esteem, and low social acceptance; while high masculinity in males has been shown to correlate in adulthood with high neuroticism, and low self-acceptance; and cross-sex-typing has been found to correlate with greater intellectual development, higher overall intelligence, greater spatial ability, and more creativity (p. 635).

In a later review of the sex-typing literature, Hoffman and Fidell (1979) reiterate many of Bem's earlier conclusions, concluding themselves that the bulk of the evidence suggests that sex-typing is related to poor adjustment. They report that highly masculine adult men tend to be more anxious, guilt-prone, neurotic and suspicious, generally lacking in warmth, brightness, emotional stability, sensitivity, and sophistication, and have less dominance, capacity for status, self-acceptance, self-assurance, sociability, and capacity for introspection, and more ego control and need for self-abasement, than men

reporting masculine traits less strongly. They further state that feminine-typed women have been described as anxious, low in social acceptance, self-concept, and self-esteem, and that strong, biologically consistent sex-typing appears to have a negative effect on intellectual development in children of both sexes (p. 766).

In a series of research studies using the BSRI and designed specifically to empirically test androgyny assumptions, Bem (1975b; Bem & Lenney, 1976; Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976) has contrasted the behavior deficits of non-androgynous subjects with the cross-situational behavioral adaptability and effectiveness of androgynous individuals and the results have been offered as further support of the hypothesis that rigid sex-typed behavior is, in actual fact, more dysfunctional than beneficial. In a conceptual replication and extension of Bem's research, Helmreich, Spence, & Holahan (1979) have reported reasonably similar findings.

Androgynous individuals of both sexes not only performed simple cross sex-typed behaviors (like nailing two boards together or winding a package of yarn into a ball) with little reluctance or discomfort, but responded appropriately and flexibly to situational cues, displaying high levels of "masculine" independence when under pressure to conform and "feminine" nurturance when interacting with a kitten or a baby.

In contrast, sex-typed individuals generally displayed

a constricted and dysfunctional pattern of avoidance behavior. In addition to actively avoiding a wide variety of simple, everyday activities deemed stereotypically inappropriate, they reported considerable discomfort and even some temporary loss of self-esteem when actually required to perform such activities. Furthermore, this avoidance pattern was not limited to a reluctance to perform simple sex inappropriate tasks, but appeared to constrict the individual's overall instrumental and expressive functioning as well.

D. The Effective Manager

Historically, management theorists have varied in their descriptions of the most successful and effective managerial type or style. In fact, over the years theoretical opinion has shifted so radically that virtually every form of leadership style has been alternately subject to praise and criticism.

One of the earliest theoretical perspectives, the scientific management era, began about 1910 and is credited to Frederick W. Taylor. The basis for this movement was largely technological, the goal being to increase output through an improvement of the techniques and methods used by workers. Theorists supporting this school of thought considered people as instruments or machines to be manipulated and believed that the worker's prime motivation was money. Consequently, much attention was focused on

rational planning and execution through time and motion studies, with an emphasis on material incentives, to promote efficiency and increase production. In essence, the concern was with task and performance, while human affairs and emotions were considered outside the realm of management concern. Workers were expected to adjust to management, and their needs were felt to be either unimportant or non-existent. Consequently, the effective manager was portrayed at this time as the individual who exhibited primarily stereotypical masculine traits and behaviors.

A new management era dawned in the early 1930's with the advent of the Hawthorne studies and with the subsequent introduction of the human relations movement. A significant breakthrough in management thinking occurred at this time with Elton Mayo's recognition that a consideration of interpersonal relations and the feelings of employees could be potentially beneficial to the attainment of organizational goals. Management now encouraged the individual to meet his own needs through personal growth and development as well as encouraging cooperative corporate goal attainment. From the emphasis on concern for task so prevalent in the scientific management era, advocates of the human relations movement stressed a major concern for relationships. In the terms used by McGregor (1960), a Theory X approach to managing innately lazy and unreliable workers was no longer considered effective managerial behavior and was supplanted by a Theory Y managerial

approach, which regarded employees as basically self-directed and creative, thus establishing a new definition of the effective executive. Other writers, from different theoretical points of view (Argyris, 1964; Herzberg, 1966, 1976; Likert, 1967), recognized the potential benefits to both employees and the organization of a redefinition of effective managerial style, and all have advocated a shift from a model of the autocratic, authoritarian leader as maximally effective to one in which the successful leader was defined as a democratic, caring, and responsive individual. In effect, the suggestion was that instrumentality be tempered with expressivity. While the significance of stereotypically masculine characteristics to the attainment of corporate goals was recognized, the importance of stereotypically feminine attributes to effective managerial performance was also realized and these so-called feminine traits were often considered of greater consequence.

Leader behavior has been and still is often conceptualized as consisting of 2 central dimensions or skills: technical skill (alternately labelled initiating structure, goal achievement, production orientation, or task behavior), corresponding closely to the masculine stereotype; and human skill (also known as consideration, group maintenance, employee orientation, or relationship behavior), paralleling the feminine stereotype in many respects. But it was primarily with the onset of the

behavioral science era in management that the relative merits of each was recognized and the realization occurred that truly effective management could and must incorporate both skills. More importantly, researchers and theorists came to acknowledge that task and relationship concerns were not either/or dimensions on a single continuum, but were separate and distinct, and that effective leadership style could and should encompass elements of both. From a period of little or no concern for the needs and feelings of workers, to a rash of attempts to improve employee morale, management writers now proclaimed that a balanced concern for production and concern for people was the best approach to the attainment of corporate goals.

Among the early theorists who subscribed to a recognition of the importance of incorporating components of each of two complementary leadership styles, one emphasizing task and the other stressing relationships, perhaps the most influential and widely known are Blake and Mouton (1964), who popularized these concepts in their Managerial Grid. These authors suggested that a manager could simultaneously employ a mix of the two basic leadership styles, one production-oriented and the other people-oriented, to achieve the benefits of both. In addition, these theorists presented an instrument for identifying leadership style and proposed that the most desirable leader behavior was a "team management" approach, which combined maximum concern for production and maximum concern for people. The implication

here, and in the writing of other theorists, was that there could and did exist a single normatively good style of leader behavior which applied in all leadership situations, and that this theoretically ideal leadership style was typically believed to be one which integrated a high degree of both task and relationship concern. Conversely, an undesirable leadership style was usually believed to be characterized by low concern for both people and productivity.

While in basic agreement with many of Blake and Mouton's ideas, Hersey and Blanchard (1972) questioned this latter assumption, reporting considerable research evidence refuting the notion that one ideal style of managerial behavior did exist. In their review, these authors reported studies with findings which both supported and contradicted theoretical predictions in a seemingly unsystematic fashion: as often as not, leaders exhibiting the suggested ideal type of managerial behavior had low-producing sections, while leaders whose style was deemed undesirable frequently headed high-producing work groups.

In reviewing the data, they conclude that a single normative style of leader behavior seems unrealistic except in very limited settings, and propose that a further refinement of the definition of an effective executive is in order. In essence, they state that the leadership process is a dynamic one and that effectiveness is necessarily a function of the leader, his followers, and various other

situational variables. This concept of adaptive leader behavior denies the existence of any single best style of leadership, stressing instead the importance of behavioral adaptability and flexibility, and proposing that the most effective style in any particular situation depends on the important elements of situation and followers, neither of which are constants. According to this reasoning, it is consequently possible for any leadership style to be effective or ineffective depending on the context in which it occurs. For example, a task orientation, which might be effective in a situation which is ambiguous and/or which involves employees with little experience, may prove to be a poor approach in managing a group of experienced research specialists working on a familiar problem. Similarly, assertiveness on the part of a manager attending a budget review meeting would likely prove to be a successful strategy in this instance, but a useless one in a meeting designed to discuss and clarify the departmental problems of workers.

Among the contingency or interactive theorists, as they have been called, Hersey and Blanchard's Tri-Dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model is particularly useful for research purposes. These theorists have not only designed a model with intuitive appeal, but they have developed an instrument, the Leadership Adaptability Style Inventory, or LASI, which is capable of measuring leadership effectiveness in a manner congruent with currently popular management

theory. Based on what they have termed Life Cycle Theory, Hersey and Blanchard have designed a method of measuring the optimal amounts of task behavior and relationship behavior required in any given situation, while quantitatively specifying the effectiveness of a leader's style depending on how responsive the individual's behavior is to the environment. An important part of the environment is the maturity of the followers, which, in Life Cycle Theory, is indicated by the level of achievement motivation, willingness and ability to take responsibility, and task relevant education and experience of a group of followers. According to the theory, appropriately effective leadership styles depend on the level of maturity of one's followers, the flexibility demands of the situation, and the adaptability or style range of which the leader is capable, such that with immature groups, high task and low relationship behavior is optimal; with increasing group maturity, task behavior should decrease and relationship behavior increase; until finally, with above average maturity of the group, the maximally effective leader will exhibit both low task and low relationship behavior. (For a complete description and development of the Tri-Dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model, Life Cycle Theory, and the LASI measuring instrument, see Hersey & Blanchard, 1972, 1974.)

Viewed from a slightly different perspective, the development of leadership theories can be traced from the early but unsuccessful trait theorists, whose concern it was

to identify personal characteristics as determinants of good leadership, to the equally unsuccessful style theorists, who concentrated on finding the one best style of leader behavior, to the intuitively appealing approach of the contingency or situational theorists of today, who have expanded the style model by including the context as another important determinant of leadership effectiveness. Contrary to the popular managerial stereotype, few current theorists describe the effective executive solely in terms of masculine characteristics, or even in terms of a particular all-purpose best style. Typically, an interactive approach prevails such that successful leadership is rightfully regarded as a dynamic process which depends as much on the specifics of the situation as it does on the style and adaptability of the leader.

E. Androgyny and Effective Management

The implications of the concept of psychological androgyny for effective management have not gone unrecognized. As noted earlier, the stereotypic manager is essentially identical with the stereotypic man, while very much unlike the stereotypic woman. This would seem to suggest that the ideal manager should be a person who, while highly competent and task effective, may be deficient in warmth, sensitivity, and interpersonal skills. Consequently, many contemporary management writers have asserted that the most effective leader is one who conforms to neither the

masculine nor the feminine stereotype, but instead exhibits competence, independence, assertiveness, and/or expressivity, warmth, and interpersonal skill as the situation may require (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Basil, 1972; Hersey & Blanchard, 1972, 1974; Dipboye, 1975; Putnam & Heinen, 1976; Larwood & Wood, 1977).

Thus, in much the same way that advocates of psychological androgyny have argued for the non-sex-typed individual as the correct model of mental health, the argument that maximally effective managers should not have exclusively masculine characteristics rests on a realization of the potential benefits to management of a flexible mix of resources. Many stereotypically feminine traits, such as emotional warmth and expressivity, are just as prized by our society and as necessary to a fully functioning executive as are any of the instrumental, stereotypically masculine traits typically considered requisite to effective leadership. The claim has even been made that the ability to work with people and show skill in human relationships may be more vital than intelligence, decisiveness, knowledge, or job skills (Bergen & Haney, 1966). It seems intuitively reasonable that while some managerial situations may be best handled with a calculative unemotional competence, and others in which an unalloyed expressivity is ideal, the vast majority of situations probably fall somewhere in between these poles.

Some support for the notion that androgynous management

may be synonymous with effective management can be found in studies and reviews utilizing a trait approach in attempting to identify those leaders most likely to succeed. After exhaustive research seeking to determine the traits distinguishing the effective leader from the ineffective one, no single characteristic, aptitude, or physical attribute, either masculine or feminine, has been found which consistently distinguishes good leaders from bad ones (Stogdill, 1974; Putnam & Heinen, 1976). These researchers report that while self-confidence and self-esteem have been shown to have a relatively consistent positive relationship with leadership in studies conducted over the past seven decades, the research findings do not support the contention that leaders typically exhibit a high degree of self-control, that they are characterized by a lack of emotional expression, or that successful managers are high in dominance or aggressiveness.

Empirically, too, evidence exists that not only management theorists and writers, but managers themselves recognize the benefits of masculine and feminine personality traits for high ranking positions. In one previously cited study, for example, Basil (1972) compiled a list of 8 personal characteristics perceived by both men and women as requirements for upper management positions. Interestingly, of these 8 key qualities, the top ranking first 4 items could be said to be stereotypically masculine: decisiveness, consistency and objectivity, emotional stability, and

analytical ability; while the remaining 4 traits were stereotypically feminine: perception and empathy, loyalty, interest in people, and creativity.

And so, from a review of the literature and the findings of numerous empirical studies, it is apparent that many contemporary management writers recommend, essentially, the utility of an androgynous approach in effective managerial functioning. Without specifically identifying or labelling potentially successful executives as androgynous, many modern theorists suggest that both stereotypically masculine and stereotypically feminine characteristics are necessary and should be cultivated in aspiring managerial candidates irrespective of their sex.

F. Research Hypotheses

To summarize, a number of stereotypes concerning men and women in general and in management do exist. Empirical tests, however, do not provide unequivocal support for the widely-held contentions that the effective manager is typically an individual possessing predominantly masculine attributes, that male and female executives are vastly dissimilar in their outlooks, abilities, and interests, or that the stereotypes of normal men and women in our society are accurate or healthy.

Rather, current psychological research evidence suggests that androgynous males and females (individuals displaying high levels of both stereotypically masculine and

feminine traits), because of their flexibility and adaptability, may be better suited for coping with our complex society than either masculine or feminine sex-typed individuals.

Moreover, little evidence exists supporting the notion that the managerial profession tends to attract the entry of sex-typed applicants, or individuals more unlike than alike with respect to basic temperament. Indeed, there is little intuitive appeal to the idea that managerial practitioners should be primarily "feminine" females and "masculine" males, or that they should consistently vary by sex in any important attitude or behavior.

Furthermore, contrary to the popular managerial stereotype, few current theorists describe the effective executive solely in terms of masculine characteristics, or even in terms of a particular all-purpose "best" style. Typically, a situational approach prevails such that many managerial writers regard successful leadership as a dynamic process often relying as much or more on stereotypically feminine qualities as on their masculine counterparts.

It is the purpose of this study to provide an empirical test of these notions which will hopefully refute the stereotypes while supporting the realities. From a review of the stereotyping, androgyny, and managerial literature, and based on the contention that biological sex and sex-role identity are easily, and therefore frequently, confused by theorist and layman alike, several hypotheses are advanced:

Hypothesis 1: It is suggested that sex and sex-role identity are not related to the extent that males are only, or significantly more often, masculine while females are only, or significantly more often, feminine. While it is true that some managers will exhibit characteristics stereotypically consistent with their biological sex (appropriately sex-typed individuals), the expectation is that many others will display traits more characteristic of the opposite sex (cross sex-typed individuals), will hold a sexual identity incorporating high levels of both masculine and feminine traits (androgynous individuals), or will display low levels of both masculinity and femininity (undifferentiated individuals).

Hypothesis 2: It is further proposed that biological sex and managerial effectiveness will prove to be unrelated. It is expected that this independence will be reflected in the finding that, contrary to popular stereotype, males and females of similar qualifications and experience will be approximately equally effective in managerial situations.

Hypothesis 3: Finally, and perhaps most importantly, this study submits that sex-role identity and managerial effectiveness are highly associated. More

specifically, it is expected that:

1. androgynous individuals of both sexes will prove to be maximally effective; while
2. masculine and feminine sex-typed individuals will be found to be of intermediate and approximately equal managerial effectiveness; and
3. undifferentiated individuals will prove to be the least effective managerial candidates.

II. METHOD

A. Subjects

The sample was composed of 160 middle line managers from a representative cross-section of departments within a large, Edmonton-based company. Of this number, 80 were male and 80 were female. Subjects of both sexes were selected at random from among those employees roughly comparable in several important respects: respondents who were chosen had neither advanced exceptionally quickly nor lagged particularly slowly, relative to their peers, in attaining their 1st and 2nd level management positions.

More specifically, subjects ranged in age from 29-42 years, with an average age of 35 years. All had been employees of the company from 7-16 years, with a mean length of service of 10 years. In terms of managerial experience, all had held their present, or an equivalent position, for 4-13 years with an average of 8 years experience. On average, subjects supervised 9 employees, with a span of control ranging from 4-15 subordinates. Educationally, the majority of respondents had completed Grade 12, with approximately 25% reporting some post-secondary training, and all completing from 2-6 management training courses offered by the company. As a group, males and females did not vary significantly from one another with respect to any of the parameters outlined.

B. Materials

A 3-part questionnaire was used to elicit self-report information from each subject concerning pertinent personal data, leadership style, range, and effectiveness, and sex-role identity.

Part 1: Personal Information and Instructions

The first part of the questionnaire consisted of various questions dealing with the age, sex, length of service, managerial position and experience, span of control, and education of the respondent. The extensive personal information obtained from each respondent was collected for the sole purpose of ensuring that those individuals apt to be atypical by virtue of their very rapid or extremely slow advancement were excluded, and is the basis of the subject information previously reported.

As well, a brief description of the purpose of the study and some instructions concerning the completion of the remainder of the questionnaire appeared in this section (see Appendix 1 for a list of the background questions asked and the instructions given).

Part 2: Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory (LASI)

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of the Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory or LASI (Hersey & Blanchard, 1974), an instrument developed to measure dominant leadership style and supporting style(s), style range and adaptability, and leader effectiveness. Based on principles of Life Cycle Theory as developed and reported by

Hersey and Blanchard (1972), the inventory consists of 12 mock leadership situations requiring some leader intervention and 4 alternative actions for each from which the subject must choose. Each alternative action is weighted from +2 to -2 in terms of its probability of success, such that the most effective leader behavior is weighted a +2, the next receives a +1 rating, the third appears with a -1 score, and the behavior with the lowest probability of success is weighted a -2. Subjects self-report for each situation, selecting the alternative action most similar to the way they believe they would behave if actually faced with the situation described. On the basis of their responses, a situational analysis is performed such that dominant and supporting leadership styles are determined, and a total score ranging from -24 to +24 is assigned which indicates the leadership effectiveness of the individual (see Hersey & Blanchard, 1972, 1974; for a complete discussion of the rationale and analysis of the instrument; the LASI appears as Appendix 2 of this paper).

Part 3: Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ)

The final part of the questionnaire was the short form of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire originally developed by Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1974), and reported in condensed form by Spence and Helmreich (1978). Used to assess masculinity, femininity, and androgyny, the shortened version of the instrument consists of 24 bipolar pairs of adjectives describing personal characteristics, on

each of which respondents are to rate themselves on a 5-point scale. Basically, the questionnaire is divided into 3 scales of 8 items each, labelled Masculinity (M), Femininity (F), and Masculinity-Femininity (M-F). Scoring for each item ranges from 0 to 4, where a high score on the M and M-F scales indicates an extreme masculine response, while a high score on the F scale suggests an extreme feminine response. Total score will range from 0-32 for each scale, and combining scores on the M and F scales results in the classification of each respondent in terms of sex-role identity. The M-F scale score, which is generally disregarded, is determined for use in cases where finer classifications within categories is required (see Spence & Helmreich, 1978 for a complete discussion of the instrument's underlying rationale; the PAQ appears as Appendix 3 of this paper).

C. Procedure

Potential subjects were contacted by telephone outside the job situation regarding their willingness to participate in the research study. These individuals were informed that the study would require 15-20 minutes of their time, was strictly confidential and anonymous, and involved completing a questionnaire specifically designed to assess their managerial style.

Managers who expressed an interest and/or willingness to cooperate in the research were informed that they would

receive by mail a copy of the questionnaire, which was not a test, to be completed in a thoughtful and honest manner and returned in the accompanying self-addressed envelope as soon as possible. Subjects were further instructed to feel free to contact the researcher should they have any questions concerning the survey's instructions and were told that they would have an opportunity to discuss more fully the nature and purpose of the research and the measuring instrument at a later date.

All subjects who agreed to participate did, in fact, complete and return the questionnaire. Judging from the comments and questions received, there is good reason to believe that all respondents understood the items and used the form provided correctly. A week after the initial telephone contact, subjects who were mailed the questionnaire were again contacted to ensure that they had completed and returned the form and all questions and concerns were addressed at this time. Interested respondents were referred to the articles on which the study and its questionnaire were based, and thanked for their cooperation and attention.

III. RESULTS

Using the median split scoring method proposed by Spence and Helmreich (1975, 1978) for the short form of the PAQ, median values for the M and F scales were determined for the entire sample. The median values thus established, where the minimum is 0 and the maximum is 32, were 23 on the M scale and 22 on the F scale.

On the basis of these values, individuals were then classified by means of a 2 by 2 table according to their position above or below the median on the 2 scales. The 4 resulting cells and the identifying labels attached to each are presented as Table 1.

Table 1: SCHEME FOR CLASSIFYING INDIVIDUALS ON
M AND F SCORES BY A MEDIAN SPLIT

		Masculinity	
		Above Median	Below Median
Femininity:	Above Median	Androgynous	Feminine
	Below Median	Masculine	Undifferentiated

The percentage of total subjects and subjects by sex falling into the 4 categories defined by the median split scoring method appear as Table 2.

Table 2: PROPORTION OF MANAGERS (TOTAL AND BY SEX)
FALLING INTO EACH OF THE 4 CATEGORIES
BASED ON MEDIAN SPLITS OF M AND F SCORES

Category	Total Sample (100.0%) n=160	Males (100.0%) n=80	Females (100.0%) n=80
Androgynous (Above M/Above F)	40.0%	37.5%	42.5%
Masculine (Above M/Below F)	28.7%	40.0%	17.5%
Feminine (Below M/Below F)	24.4%	17.5%	31.2%
Undifferentiated (Below M/Below F)	6.9%	5.0%	8.8%

Here it was found that males differed significantly from the popular stereotype of them as predominantly masculine (chi-square (3) = 28.80, $p < 0.001$), and that there was a significantly unequal distribution of men across sex-role identities (chi-square (3) = 26.80, $p < 0.001$). Male managers fell predominantly and approximately equally often in the androgynous and masculine categories, appeared considerably less frequently in the feminine cell, and were very seldom found in the undifferentiated classification.

Similarly, it was observed that females differed significantly from the prevalent stereotype of them as primarily feminine (chi-square (3) = 37.81, $p < 0.001$), and that there was a significantly unequal distribution of women across sex-role identities (chi-square (3) = 21.30, $p <$

0.001). Female managers appeared most often in the androgynous cell, were classified less often in the feminine category, fell more infrequently yet in the masculine classification, and appeared most infrequently of all in the undifferentiated category.

Using the LASI scoring guide presented by Hersey and Blanchard (1974), leadership style adaptability, or effectiveness, with a theoretical range from -24 to +24, was determined for each individual manager. Sectioning the sample alternately by sex and sex-role identity, an analysis of variance was then performed and the major findings are reported in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3: MEAN EFFECTIVENESS SCORES (ADAPTABILITY)
FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE BY SEX AND SEX-ROLE
IDENTITY

	SEX:		
	Male (n=80)	Female (n=80)	TOTAL (n=160)
SEX-ROLE IDENTITY:			
Androgynous (n=64)	7.77	6.65	7.17
Masculine (n=46)	3.88	2.00	3.31
Feminine (n=39)	4.07	2.12	2.82
Undifferentiated (n=11)	-5.00	1.29	-1.00
TOTAL	4.93	3.95	4.44

Table 4: SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE INVOLVING SEX, SEX-ROLE IDENTITY, AND EFFECTIVENESS

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F
Main Effects:				
SEX	1002.826	4	250.707	3.525 *
S-R IDENTITY	38.043	1	38.043	0.535
	964.801	3	321.600	4.521 **
2-Way Interaction:				
SEX / S-R ID.	150.920	3	50.307	0.707
Residual (Error)	10811.406	152	71.128	
TOTAL	11965.156	159	75.253	

* $p = 0.009$

** $p = 0.005$

From this analysis, it is apparent that biological sex is unrelated to managerial effectiveness ($F(1, 152) = 0.535$, $p = 0.466$), and the mean effectiveness score found for males (4.93) does not differ significantly from that obtained by females (3.95).

It is clear, however, that sex-role identity and managerial effectiveness are highly associated, ($F(3, 152) = 4.521$, $p = 0.005$). Applying Duncan's multiple range test to the effectiveness means of the 4 sex-role identity

categories results in the finding that androgynous managers (mean = 7.17) score significantly higher, on the average, than any of the other sex-role identity groups. The effectiveness means for executives with masculine (mean = 3.31) and feminine (mean = 2.82) sex-role identities are intermediate and approximately equal, while undifferentiated managers (mean = -1.00) have a mean effectiveness score significantly lower than any other sex-role identity category.

IV. DISCUSSION

On the basis of daily observation, practical experience in the workforce, and an extensive review of the literature, it has been observed that a strong negative bias towards the aspiring female executive exists even today. Despite the many social and legal pressures designed to counter such anti-female prejudice, many managerial women find themselves in the unenviable position of having to defend themselves against charges of incompetence based solely on the fact of their gender.

In particular, many laymen and managers alike are firmly convinced that managerial success requires from incumbents certain traits and abilities more frequently believed to be typical of men. In fact, so much popular opinion exists in support of male and female stereotypes and the necessity of masculine qualities in the effective functioning of the executive, that the problem of underutilization of working women is becoming increasingly serious.

After a careful review of the managerial and sex-role literature, and the writings of many current and eminent theorists, it was proposed that the discrimination experienced by existing and aspiring female executives is due, in large measure, to a basic confusion on the part of many laymen and theorists regarding biological sex and sex-role identity, and the relation of these elements to

managerial effectiveness. To a lesser extent, the paucity of research designed to dispel the myths and inaccuracies that developed around women at a time when it was socially and economically desirable that women remain in the home may also be responsible for the slow assimilation of women into responsible positions in the workforce. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to add one more piece of evidence to a small, but growing, body of research which contends, not only that feminine qualities are just as important as masculine ones to the fully functioning executive, but also that many stereotypical notions about sex and sex-role identity are simply false.

To this end, a carefully selected sample of middle managers of both sexes was selected for examination. Not surprisingly, an analysis of the research findings obtained lends considerable support to the major contentions upon which this study was predicated. In whole or in part, the major assumptions derived from the literature and advanced hypothetically appear to have some basis in fact.

First, consistent with investigators of psychological androgyny (e.g. Bem, Spence & Helmreich) in other populations (e.g. with high school and college students), this study suggested that sex and sex-role identity among managers would similarly be found to be independent. To this end, the short form of the PAQ (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) was employed and, using this instrument, substantial support for the hypothesis was obtained. As predicted, cross

sex-typed, androgynous, and undifferentiated managers of both sexes were discovered in addition to those individuals considered appropriately sex-typed.

It was additionally suggested that, as a group, male and female managers would be very similar in their effectiveness. Effectiveness, as measured by the style adaptability score attained by each manager on Hersey and Blanchard's LASI (1974) did, in fact, prove to be relatively independent of biological sex. As hypothesized, female executives, as a group, proved no less effective in mock managerial situations requiring intervention than males of equal qualifications and experience.

Finally, it was proposed that sex-role identity, not biological sex, would be found to be closely correlated with managerial effectiveness. Again, as predicted, androgynous individuals constituted the most effective group of managers overall; while masculine and feminine sex-typed managers were moderately, and approximately equal in effectiveness; and undifferentiated individuals were clearly the least effective group of managers.

It is difficult to hazard a guess as to why, in the face of so much contradictory evidence and in light of the views expressed by a number of thoughtful and well-informed management theorists, the stereotype of the effective manager as a masculine individual, and preferably a male, has remained so firmly entrenched in the minds of so many laymen and managers. Several possible explanations for this

phenomenon exist and deserve exploration in future research.

Perhaps it is a function of the more obtrusive nature of masculine characteristics in general, and the tendency of feminine traits to be less obvious and salient. It is quite conceivable that the stereotype developed as it has because of the differential visibility of these two sets of attributes. While quite correct in its recognition of the importance of the so-called masculine traits to the fully functioning executive, its error is one of omission: it fails to acknowledge the equally important role of the so-called feminine attributes in the personality of the effective manager.

Or, it may well be that, in reality, there is a modicum of truth to the stereotype of the ineffective female manager. The research reported here and elsewhere provides striking evidence of the managerial woman's potential, but it could be argued that these findings have little real world validity, reflecting the ideal substantially more than the real. While theorists and researchers tend to focus, quite validly, on the way things could and should be, laymen and practitioners tend to direct their attention, equally correctly, to the way things are.

This is not to suggest that females are innately any less capable or competent than their male counterparts, but simply that the differential expectations and experiences the sexes face on the job could conceivably result in a self-fulfilling prophecy. That is, men may owe some portion

of their managerial success to the positive expectations of self and others, while conversely, the lower effectiveness of female managers may be due in part to the more negative expectations both men and other women have for their success.

Experientially, too, the treatment accorded men and women managers is an important factor which undoubtedly affects performance. More than any inherent quality, ability, or lack thereof, it is perhaps the unique pressures and constraints of the real world work experience that best account for any suboptimal managerial performance on the part of the female executive. Frustrated by their lack of upward mobility relative to that of their male peers, or by the nature of their role in the organization compared to that of the men around them with equal or lesser abilities, the work experience is not one designed to bring out the best qualities of the female executive.

Regardless of the reason or reasons for this widespread belief in the general and inherent superiority of the male manager, the situation does indeed exist and is clearly in need of being remedied.

One important means of combatting negative attitudes toward female managers involves increasing the number and visibility of successful managerial women. As more and more young women aspire to the managerial profession, it is essential that many more successfully functioning role-models to emulate and identify with be available to

them than is currently the case. Popular attitudes are extremely resistant to change, and it is only when effective female executives are the norm, rather than a curious anomaly, that both men and women will begin to treat existing and aspiring female executives in the positive fashion necessary to redirect the self-fulfilling prophecy in a positive direction.

Another way to overcome this harmful bias and alter the prevalent stereotype is through the systematic and frequent demonstration, in a wide variety of situations, that popular stereotypes are inaccurate, that biological sex and sex-role identity are separate and should not be confused, and that effective managers are, in fact, neither masculine nor feminine, but capable of being either or both as the situation demands.

Clearly, replication and extension of these findings is badly needed with diverse populations, materials, and methodologies. The present study is not without constraints, nor have these limitations gone unrecognized. Closely aligned with the matter of the real world validity of the present research is the question of methodological soundness.

For practical and theoretical reasons, the current study was designed to provide a measure of both managerial effectiveness and sex-role identity unbiased by the realities of corporate existence. The use of a self-report inventory, the operational definitions of major concepts

adopted in the research, and the specific instruments selected to measure these concepts all raise issues which warrant further testing of the conclusions.

As self-report measures, for example, the LASI and the PAQ suffer from traditional disadvantages common to all instruments of this genre. As has been aptly pointed out by critics of this procedure (e.g. Orne, 1962; Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, & Sechrest, 1971; Arnoult, 1972; Carlsmith, Ellsworth, & Aronson, 1976; Emory, 1976), accuracy and objectivity may be, deliberately or accidentally, secondary to respondents and sacrificed readily to meet other, more self-serving objectives.

Whether other pencil-and-paper measures of managerial effectiveness and/or sex-role identity, based on different operational definitions of these concepts, would have resulted in substantially different findings is an issue open to conjecture. Similarly, the use of more traditional behavioral measures could have yielded findings dissimilar in many important respects to those obtained through the use of attitudinal measures alone.

What is needed now are tests of the general applicability of these results to situations less structured and artificial. Studies which substitute direct observation, role-play and/or superior and subordinate interview for the self-report questionnaire technique employed here are indicated. Similarly, research involving more highly diversified, and perhaps more representative, groups of male

and female executives would also be in order.

This research, and that yet to come, while seemingly about women in management, is, more importantly, about people in management. The myths surrounding both corporate men and women are of little service to either sex, requiring behavior which is stereotypical and not necessarily in the best interests of either the manager or his/her position. Only when the biases and confusions surrounding the successful executive have been thoroughly tested and laid to rest can the full and effective utilization of both halves of the workforce ever be realized.

REFERENCES

- Argyris, C. Integrating the individual and the organization. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.
- Arnoult, M.D. Fundamentals of scientific method in psychology. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1972.
- Astin, H.S. Employment and career status of women psychologists. American Psychologist, 1972, 27, 371-381.
- Athanassiades, J.C. Myths of women in management: What every businessman ought to know but may be afraid to ask. In D.O. Jewell (Ed.), Women and management: An expanding role. Atlanta, Ga.: Publishing Services Division, School of Bus. Admin., Georgia State Univ., 1977, 181-195. (Reprinted from Atlanta Economic Review, May-June 1975, 4-9.)
- Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Chicago, Ill.: Rand McNally, 1966.
- Bartol, K.M. Male versus female leaders: The effect of leader need for dominance on follower satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 1974, 17, 225-233.
- Bartol, K.M. The effect of male versus female leaders on follower satisfaction and performance, Journal of Business Research, 1975, 3, 33-42.
- Basil, D.C. Women in management. New York: Dunellen, 1972.
- Bass, B.M., Krusell, J., & Alexander, R.H. Male managers' attitudes toward working women. American Behavioral Scientist, 1971, 15, 221-236.
- Bazin, N.T., & Freeman, A. The androgynous vision. Women's Studies, 1974, 2, 185-215.
- Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

- Bem, S.L. Androgyny vs. the tight little lives of fluffy women and chesty men. Psychology Today, 1975a, 9(4), 58-62.
- Bem, S.L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975b, 31, 634-643.
- Bem, S.L. Psychological androgyny. In A.G. Sargent (Ed.), Beyond sex roles, St. Paul, Minn.: West, 1977a.
- Bem, S.L. On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977b, 45, 196-205.
- Bem, S.L. Theory and measurement of androgyny: A reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colten critiques. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1047-1054.
- Bem, S.L., & Lenney, E. Sex typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 48-54.
- Bem, S.L., Martyna, W., & Watson, C. Sex typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.
- Bennett, W.W. Institutional barriers to the utilization of women in top management. Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 25, 5605.
- Bergen, G.L., & Haney, W.V. Organizational relations and management action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Berzins, J.I., Welling, M.A., & Wetter, R.E. A new measure of psychological androgyny based on the Personality Research Form. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 48, 126-138.
- Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. The managerial grid. Houston, Tex.: Gulf Publishing, 1964.

- Block, J.H. Conceptions of sex-role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-526.
- Bond, J.R., & Vinacke, W.E. Coalitions in mixed-sex triads. Sociometry, 1961, 24, 61-75.
- Bowman, G.W., Worthy, N.B., & Greyser, S.A. Are women executive people? Harvard Business Review, 1965, 43(4), 14-28, 164-178.
- Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S., & Vogel, S.R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.
- Broverman, I.K., Vogel, S.R., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., & Rosenkrantz, P.S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.
- Brown, S.M. Male versus female leaders: A comparison of empirical studies. Sex Roles, 1979, 5, 595-611.
- Bryce, R.A. Characteristics of women holding executive, managerial, and other high level positions in four areas of business. Dissertation Abstracts, 1970, 30, 4216A-4217A.
- Burrow, M.G. Developing women managers: What needs to be done? (an AMA Survey Report) New York: AMACOM, 1978.
- Carlsmith, J.M., Ellsworth, P.C., & Aronson, E. Methods of research in social psychology. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1976.
- Cecil, E.A., Paul, R.J., & Olins, R.A. Perceived importance of selected variables used to evaluate male and female job applicants. Personnel Psychology, 1973, 26, 397-404.
- Chapman, J.B. Comparison of male and female leadership styles. Academy of Management Journal, 1975, 18, 645-650.

Cohen, S.L., & Bunker, K.A. Subtle effects of sex-role stereotypes on recruiters' hiring decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 566-572.

Cohen, S.L., Bunker, K.A., Burton, A.L., & McManus, P.D. Reactions of male subordinates to the sex-role congruency of immediate supervision. Sex Roles, 1978, 4, 297-311.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.

Crowley, J.E., Levitin, T.E., & Quinn, R.P. Seven deadly half-truths about women. Psychology Today, 1973, 6(10), 94-96.

Day, D.R., & Stogdill, R.M. Leader behavior of male and female supervisors: A comparative study. Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 353-360.

Deaux, K., & Taynor, J. Evaluation of male and female ability: Bias works two ways. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32, 261-262.

Denmark, F.L., & Diggory, J.C. Sex differences in attitudes toward leaders' display of authoritarian behavior. Psychological Reports, 1966, 18, 863-872.

Dipboye, R.L. Women as managers: Stereotypes and realities. In B.A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978, 2-9. (Reprinted from Survey of Business, May/June 1975, 22-26.)

Dipboye, R.L., Fromkin, H.L., & Wiback, K. Relative importance of applicant sex, attractiveness, and scholastic standing in evaluation of job applicant resumes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 39-43.

Durkin, J.J. The potential of women. In B.A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978, 42-46. (Reprinted from Congressional Record, 1971, 117(23), 31088-31089.)

Ellis, L.J., & Bentler, P.M. Traditional sex-determined role standards and sex stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 28-34.

Emory, C.W. Business research methods. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1976.

Epstein, C.F. Institutional barriers: What keeps women out of the executive suite? In F.E. Gordon & M.H. Strober (Eds.), Bringing women into management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, 7-21.

Eskilson, A., & Wiley, M.G. Sex composition and leadership in small groups. Sociometry, 1976, 39, 183-194.

Fenn, M. Female dimension: Barriers to effective utilization of women in the world of work. In B.A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978, 25-33. (Reprinted from Journal of the Society of Research Administrators, Winter 1976, 19-25.)

Fernberger, S.W. Persistence of stereotypes concerning sex differences. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1948, 43, 97-101.

Fidell, L.S. Empirical verification of sex discrimination in hiring practices in psychology. American Psychologist, 1970, 25, 1094-1098.

Garai, J.E., & Scheinfeld, A. Sex differences in mental and behavioral traits. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1968, 77, 169-299.

Gilmer, B. Industrial psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Goldberg, P.A. Are some women prejudiced against women? Trans-action, 1968, 5(5), 28-30.

Gordon, F.E., & Strober, M.H. (Eds.). Bringing women into management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Haefner, J.E. Race, age, sex, and competence as factors in employer selection of the disadvantaged. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 199-202.

Heilbrun, A.B., Jr. Measurement of masculine and feminine sex-role identities as independent dimensions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 183-190.

Heilbrun, C.G. Toward a recognition of androgyny. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973.

Helmich, D.C. Male and female presidents: Some implications of leadership styles. Human Resource Management, 1974, 13(4), 25-26.

Helmreich, R.L., Spence, J.T., & Holahan, C.K. Psychological androgyny and sex-role flexibility: A test of two hypotheses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1631-1644.

Hennig, M., & Jardim, A. The managerial woman. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources, (2nd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. So you want to know your leadership style? Training and Development Journal, 1974, 28(2), 22-37.

Herzberg, F. Work and the nature of man. New York: World Publishing, 1966.

Herzberg, F. The managerial choice: To be efficient and to be human. Homewood, Ill.: Dow Irwin-Jones, 1976.

Hobart, C.L., & Harries, K.L. Sex-role stereotyping among future managers. In D.O. Jewell (Ed.), Women and management: An expanding role. Atlanta, Ga.: Publishing Services Division, School of Bus. Admin., Georgia State Univ., 1977, 197-216.

- Hoffman, D.M., & Fidell, L.S. Characteristics of androgynous, undifferentiated, masculine, and feminine middle-class women. Sex Roles, 1979, 5, 765-781.
- Jacklin, C.N., & Maccoby, E.E. Sex differences and their implications for management. In F.E. Gordon & M.H. Strober (Eds.), Bringing women into management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, 23-38.
- Jacobson, M.B., & Effertz, J. Sex-roles and leadership perceptions of the leaders and the led. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1974, 12, 383-396.
- Jewell, D.O. (Ed.). Women and management: An expanding role. Atlanta, Ga.: Publishing Services Division, School of Bus. Admin., Georgia State Univ., 1977.
- Jones, R.H. Sex prejudice: Effects on the inferential process of judging hireability. Dissertation Abstracts, 1970, 31, 1013A.
- Larwood, L., & Wood, M.M. Women in management. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1977.
- Levitin, T.E., Quinn, R.P., & Staines, G.L. Sex discrimination against the American working woman. American Behavioral Scientist, 1971, 15, 237-254.
- Levitin, T.E., Quinn, R.P., & Staines, G.L. A woman is 58% of a man. Psychology Today, 1973, 6(10), 89-91.
- Likert, R. The human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Lifziman, S.I., & Wahba, M.A. Determinants of coalitional behavior of men and women: Sex-roles or situational requirements? Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 406-411.
- Locksley, A., & Colten, M.E. Psychological androgyny: A case of mistaken identity? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1017-1031.

- Loring, R., & Wells, T. Breakthrough: Women into management. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1972.
- Maccoby, E.E., & Jacklin, C.N. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Maier, N.R.F. Male versus female discussion leaders. Personnel Psychology, 1970, 23, 455-461.
- Massengill, D., & DiMarco, N. Sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics: A current replication. Sex Roles, 1979, 5, 561-570.
- McGregor, D. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- McGregor, D. The professional manager. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- McKee, J.P., & Sherriffs, A.C. The differential evaluation of males and females. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 356-371.
- McKee, J.P., & Sherriffs, A.C. Men's and women's beliefs, ideals, and self-concepts. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64, 356-363.
- Megaree, E.I. Influence of sex-roles on the manifestation of leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 377-382.
- Miner, J.B. Motivation to manage among women: Studies of business managers and educational administrators. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 5, 197-208.
- O'Leary, V.E. Some attitudinal barriers to occupational aspirations in women. Psychological Bulletin, 1974, 81, 809-826.
- Orne, M.T. On the social psychology of the psychological experiment. In P. Badia, A. Haber, & R.P. Runyon (Eds.), Research problems in psychology. Reading, Mass.:

Addison-Wesley, 1970, 3-17. (Reprinted from American Psychologist, 1962, 17, 776-783.)

Osborn, R.N., & Vicars, W.M. Sex stereotypes: An artifact in leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction analysis? Academy of Management Journal, 1976, 19, 439-449.

Parsons, T., & Bales, R.F. Family, socialization, and interaction process. New York: Free Press, 1955.

Pedhazur, E.J., & Tetenbaum, T.J. Bem sex-role inventory: A theoretical and methodological critique. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 996-1016.

Pheterson, G.I., Kiesler, S.B., & Goldberg, P.A. Evaluation of the performance of women as a function of their sex, achievement, and personal history. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 19, 114-118.

Pleck, J.H. Masculinity-femininity: current and alternative paradigms. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 161-178.

Powell, G.N., & Butterfield, D.A. The "good manager": Masculine or androgynous? Academy of Management Journal, 1979, 22, 395-403.

Prather, J. Why can't women be more like men. American Behavioral Scientist, 1971, 15, 172-182.

Putnam, L., & Heinen, J.S. Women in management: The fallacy of the trait approach. In B.A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978, 249-257. (Reprinted from MSU Business Topics, Summer 1976, 47-53.)

Rebecca, M., Hefner, R., & Oleshansky, B. A model of sex-role transcendence. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 197-206.

Reif, W.E., Newstrom, J.W., & Monczka, R.M. Exploding some myths about women managers. In B.A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978, 11-23. (Reprinted from California Management Review, 1975, 17, 72-79.)

- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T.H. The influence of sex-role stereotypes on evaluations of male and female supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 44-48.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T.H. Influence of sex-role stereotypes on personnel decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974a, 59, 9-14.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T.H. Effects of applicant's sex and difficulty of job on evaluations of candidates for managerial positions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974b, 59, 511-512.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T.H. Sex stereotyping in the executive suite. Harvard Business Review, 1974c, 52(2), 45-58.
- Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T.H. Perceived sex differences in managerially relevant characteristics. Sex Roles, 1978, 4, 837-843.
- Rosenkrantz, P.S., & Vogel, S.R., Bee, H., Broverman, I.K., & Broverman, D.M. Sex-role stereotypes and self concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.
- Sashkin, M., & Maier, N. Sex effects in delegation. Personnel Psychology, 1971, 24, 471-476.
- Schein, V.E. The relationship between sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 95-100.
- Schein, V.E. Relationships between sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 340-344.
- Schein, V.E. Think manager-think male. In D.O. Jewell (Ed.), Women and management: An expanding role. Atlanta, Ga.: Publishing Services Division, School of Bus. Admin., Georgia State Univ., 1977. (Reprinted from Atlanta Economic Review, March-April, 1976, 21-24.)

Schwartz, E.B. Entrepreneurship: A new female frontier. Journal of Contemporary Business, 1976, 5(1), 47-76.

Shaw, E.A. Differential impact of negative stereotyping in employee selection. Personnel Psychology, 1972, 25, 333-338.

Sherriffs, A.C., & McKee, J.P. Qualitative aspects of beliefs about men and women. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 451-464.

Spence, J.T., & Helmreich, R.L. Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press, 1978.

Spence J.T., & Helmreich, R.L. The many faces of androgyny: A reply to Locksley and Colten. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1032-1046.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R.L., & Stapp, J. The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1974, 4, 127. (Ms. No. 617)

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R.L., & Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.

Stead, B.A. (Ed.). Women in management. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Stogdill, R.M. Handbook of leadership: Theory and research. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Tavris, C., & Offir, C. The longest war: Sex differences in perspective. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

Terborg, J.R. Women in management: A research review. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 647-664.

Terborg, J.R., & Ilgen, D.R. A theoretical approach to sex discrimination in traditionally masculine occupations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1975, 13, 352-376.

Treiman, D.J., & Terrell, K. Sex and the process of status attainment: A comparison of working women and men. American Sociological Review, 1975, 40, 174-200.

Veiga, J.F., & Yanouzas, J.N. What women in management want: The ideal vs. the real. Academy of Management Journal, 1976, 19, 137-143.

Vinacke, W.E. Sex-roles in a three-person game. Sociometry, 1959, 22, 343-360.

Webb, E.J., Campbell, D.T., Schwartz, R.D., & Sechert, L. Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences. Chicago, Ill.: Rand McNally, 1971.

Wexley, K.N., & Hunt, P.J. Male and female leaders: Comparison of performance and behavior patterns. Psychological Reports, 1974, 35, 867-872.

Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment Standards Administration, 1974. The myth and the reality. In B.A. Stead (Ed.), Women in management. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978, 47-50.

APPENDICES

A. Appendix 1: Personal Information and Instructions

Personal Information

Sex: M or F (please circle one)

Age: _____ years

Education: Highest level attained (please check):

☐ High School☐ Some post-secondary☐ University Degree☐ Other (please specify): _____

Other training (please list):

Management training courses
within the company _____

outside the company _____

Other _____

Length of time with company: _____ years _____ months

Length of time in present position: _____ years _____ months

Management level of present position: 1st or 2nd
(please circle one)

Number of employees currently supervised: _____

Previous management positions held **WITHIN** the company:
 (length of time in position, management level,
 number of subordinates) _____

Previous management positions held **OUTSIDE** the company:
 (length of time in position, management level,
 number of subordinates) _____

Instructions

The remainder of this survey consists of 2 parts designed to assess your managerial style. Please make sure you answer every question in each part. Even if none of the choices provided seem completely appropriate, or if a question appears irrelevant, please answer it anyway, selecting the best alternative from those provided.

This questionnaire is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers: there are only answers which best describe different styles of behavior. Please answer every question as thoughtfully and honestly as possible. All replies are strictly confidential and anonymous.

NOTE: The answers you give to each question should reflect the kind of person you are, not the kind you would like to be. In Part 1, please answer each question with the response closest to the one you think you would actually make, not the response you feel is ideal or most desirable. Similarly, in Part 2, rate yourself as you actually believe you are, not as you would like to be or you feel is best.

When you have completed the questionnaire and ensured that no blanks have been left, please return it by mail as soon as possible in the self-addressed envelope provided. If you have any questions regarding the completion of this survey after you have read it over, feel free to contact me, Lynn Hazen, at 459-5708 (res.) or 432-5847 (bus.).

If you wish to learn more about yourself and your style of leadership, you may keep a copy of your questionnaire and answers. You will be contacted in approximately 1 week, at which time the study will be explained more fully, and any other questions or concerns you have will be discussed.

Thank you in advance for your much appreciated time and cooperation with this research.

B. Appendix 2: Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory or LASI

Assume you are involved in each of the following 12 situations. READ each item carefully. THINK about what you would do in each circumstance. Then CIRCLE the letter of the alternative action choice which you think would most closely describe your behavior in the situation presented. Circle only one choice and make sure that you answer every question.

(Note: The bracketed number preceding each alternative action (i.e. -2, -1, +1, or +2) indicates the effectiveness weighting of that choice used in deriving a total inventory score for each respondent. Subjects were not aware of these values while completing the questionnaire and they are included here for illustrative purposes only. For a complete discussion of scoring, see Hersey and Blanchard (1974).)

SITUATION 1

Your subordinates are not responding lately to your friendly conversation and obvious concern for their welfare. Their performance is in a tailspin.

Alternative Actions

- (+2) 1. Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity for task accomplishment.
- (-1) 2. Make yourself available for discussion, but don't push.
- (+1) 3. Talk with subordinates and then set goals.
- (-2) 4. Intentionally do not intervene.

SITUATION 2

The observable performance of your group is increasing. You have been making sure that all members were aware of their roles and standards.

Alternative Actions

- (+2) 1. Engage in friendly interaction, but continue to make sure that all members are aware of their roles and standards.
- (-2) 2. Take no definite action.
- (+1) 3. Do what you can to make the group feel important and involved.
- (-1) 4. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.

SITUATION 3

Members of your group are unable to solve a problem themselves. You have normally left them alone. Group performance and interpersonal relations have been good.

Alternative Actions

- (+1) 1. Involve the group and together engage in problem-solving.
- (-1) 2. Let the group work it out.
- (-2) 3. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
- (+2) 4. Encourage the group to work on the problem and be available for discussion.

SITUATION 4

You are considering a major change. Your subordinates have a fine record of accomplishment. They respect the need for change.

Alternative Actions

- (+1) 1. Allow group involvement in developing the change, but don't push.
- (-2) 2. Announce changes and then implement with close supervision.
- (+2) 3. Allow the group to formulate its own direction.
- (-1) 4. Incorporate group recommendations, but you direct the change.

SITUATION 5

The performance of your group has been dropping during the last few months. Members have been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Redefining roles has helped in the past. They have continually needed reminding to have their tasks done on time.

Alternative Actions

- (-2) 1. Allow the group to formulate its own direction.
- (+1) 2. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
- (+2) 3. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
- (-1) 4. Allow group involvement in setting goals, but don't push.

SITUATION 6

You stepped into an efficiently run situation. The previous administrator ran a tight ship. You want to maintain a productive situation, but would like to begin humanizing the environment.

Alternative Actions

- (-1) 1. Do what you can to make the group feel important and involved.
- (+1) 2. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.
- (-2) 3. Intentionally do not intervene.
- (+2) 4. Get the group involved in decision-making, but see that objectives are met.

SITUATION 7

You are considering major changes in your organizational structure. Members of the group have made suggestions about needed change. The group has demonstrated flexibility in its day-to-day operations.

Alternative Actions

- (-2) 1. Define the change and supervise carefully.
- (+2) 2. Acquire the group's approval on the change and allow members to organize the implementation.
- (-1) 3. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain control of implementation.
- (+1) 4. Avoid confrontation; leave things alone.

SITUATION 8

Group performance and interpersonal relations are good. You feel somewhat unsure about your lack of direction of the group.

Alternative Actions

- (+2) 1. Leave the group alone.
- (-1) 2. Discuss the situation with the group and then initiate necessary changes.
- (-2) 3. Take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.
- (+1) 4. Be careful of hurting boss-subordinate relations by being too directive.

SITUATION 9

Your superior has appointed you to head a task force that is far overdue in making requested recommendations for change. The group is not clear on its goals. Attendance at sessions has been poor. Their meetings have turned into social gatherings. Potentially they have the talent necessary to help.

Alternative Actions

- (-2) 1. Let the group work it out.
- (+1) 2. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
- (+2) 3. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
- (-1) 4. Allow group involvement in setting goals, but don't push.

SITUATION 10

Your subordinates, usually able to take responsibility, are not responding to your recent redefining of standards.

Alternative Actions

- (+1) 1. Allow group involvement in redefining standards, but don't push.
- (-2) 2. Redefine standards and supervise carefully.
- (-1) 3. Avoid confrontation by not applying pressure.
- (+2) 4. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that new standards are met.

SITUATION 11

You have been promoted to a new position. The previous supervisor was uninvolved in the affairs of the group. The group has adequately handled its tasks and direction. Group inter-relations are good.

Alternative Actions

- (-2) 1. Take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.
- (+2) 2. Involve subordinates in decision-making and reinforce good contributions.
- (-1) 3. Discuss past performance with the group and then you examine the need for new practices.
- (+1) 4. Continue to leave the group alone.

SITUATION 12

Recent information indicates some internal difficulties among subordinates. The group has a remarkable record of accomplishment. Members have effectively maintained long range goals. They have worked in harmony for the past year. All are well qualified for the task.

Alternative Actions

- (-1) 1. Try out your solution with subordinates and examine the need for new practices.
- (+2) 2. Allow group members to work it out themselves.
- (-2) 3. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
- (+1) 4. Make yourself available for discussion, but be careful of hurting boss-subordinate relations.

The items below inquire about what kind of a person you think you are. Each item consists of a pair of characteristics, with the letters A-E in between. For example:

Not at all Artistic	A	B	C	D	E	Very Artistic
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---------------

The letters form a scale between the two extremes. You are to choose a letter which describes where you fall on the scale. For example, if you think you have no artistic ability, you would choose A. If you think you are pretty good, you might choose D. If you are only medium, you might choose C, and so forth.

Circle only one letter on each scale and make sure that you respond to every scale.

(Note: The bracketed letter or letters preceding each item (i.e. M, F, or M-F) indicates the scale to which the adjective pair belongs. The (M) or (F) below each response indicates the extreme masculine or extreme feminine choice respectively. Subjects were not aware of these labels while completing the inventory and they are included here for illustrative purposes only. For a complete discussion of scoring, see Spence and Helmreich (1978).)

(M-F) Not at all aggressive (F)	A	B	C	D	E	Very aggressive (M)
------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

(M)	Not at all independent (F)	A	B	C	D	E	Very independent (M)
-----	----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------------

(F) Not at all emotional (M) A B C D E Very emotional (F)

(M-F) Very submissive (F) A B C D E Very dominant (M)

(M-F) Not at all excitable in a major crisis (M) A B C D E Very excitable in a major crisis (F)

(M) Very passive (F) A B C D E Very active (M)

(F) Not at all able to devote self completely to others (M) A B C D E Able to devote self completely to others (F)

(F) Very rough (M) A B C D E Very gentle (F)

(F) Not at all helpful to others (M) A B C D E Very helpful to others (F)

(M) Not at all competitive (F) A B C D E Very competitive (M)

(M-F) Very home oriented (F) A B C D E Very worldly (M)

(F) Not at all kind (M) A B C D E Very kind (F)

(M-F) Indifferent to others' approval (M) A B C D E Highly needful of others' approval (F)

(M-F) Feelings not easily hurt (M) A B C D E Feelings easily hurt (F)

(F) Not at all aware of feelings of others (M) A B C D E Very aware of feelings of others (F)

(M) Can make decisions easily (M) A B C D E Has difficulty making decisions (F)

(M) Gives up very easily (F) A B C D E Never gives up easily (M)

(M-F) Never cries (M) A B C D E Cries very easily (F)

(M) Not at all self-confident (F) A B C D E Very self-confident (M)

(M) Feels very inferior (F) A B C D E Feels very superior (M)

(F) Not at all understanding of others (M) A B C D E Very understanding of others (F)

(F) Very cold in relations with others (M) A B C D E Very warm in relations with others (F)

(M-F) Very little need for security (M) A B C D E Very strong need for security (F)

(M) Goes to pieces under pressure (F) A B C D E Stands up well under pressure (M)